

Remarks

Claims 1-4 and 6-26 were submitted for examination. Claims 6-26 were renumbered by the Examiner as 5-25. Claims 1-25 stand rejected. Claims 13 and 22 have been canceled. Claims 9, 11, 14-17, 19-21, and 23-25 have been amended.

Claims 6-26 have been renumbered to 5-25 as requested by the Examiner and have been designated as “original” unless otherwise amended.

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Trompower et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,591.

The Office Action fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation for Applicants’ claims. “[F]or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach *every aspect* of the claimed invention ...” MPEP 706.02 (emphasis added). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v., Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Trompower et al. simply fails to disclose every aspect of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any claim, as the following analysis shows.

CLAIM 1

Regarding Claim 1, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach “polling a first master transmitting device with a second master transmitting device to determine a hopping sequence of the first master transmitting device” as claimed in Claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Office Action asserts that the limitations of Claim 1 are taught in the Abstract of Trompower et al. However, Trompower et al. only discloses that each base station is configured to communicate its own particular hopping sequence to all other base stations via the system backbone. Trompower et al. discloses receiving a new base station registration packet indicating that a new base station has become part of the system and enters into a table hopping information included in the new base station registration packet. (Trompower et al., Column 24, lines 1-21) Trompower et al. does not disclose polling to determine a hopping sequence.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claim 1 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 2-12 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 14

Regarding amended Claim 14, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device” as claimed in amended Claim 14.

The Office Action asserts that the limitations of Claim 14 are taught in FIG. 15 and Column 30, lines 20-38 of Trompower et al. The Office Action states that the transmission of the registration request packet is equivalent to checking whether or not a mobile device has been handed over. Further, the Office Action states that the registration request packet is an indication of the second base station, or first master, is receiving the signal from the slave device. Receiving registration request packet is not

the same as polling a master from another master. Trompower et al. does not disclose polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 14. The rejection of Claim 14 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 15-17 depend from allowable Claim 14 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 18

Regarding Claim 18, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach “wherein the second master is adapted to provide the first master with a hopping sequence of the slave device” as claimed in Claim 18.

The Office Action asserts that the limitations of Claim 18 are taught in Column 24, lines 44-54 of Trompower et al. The Office Action states that Trompower et al. describes the mobile devices being able to send beacon packets to base stations with updated hopping sequences when moving to a new cell – however, Claim 18 requires the second master, not the slave, be adapted to provide the first master with the hopping sequence of the slave. The Office Action further asserts that since base stations also send information to each other through the backbone, it can be inferred that the mobile stations, or slaves, are in fact sending their hopping sequences to bases station or masters, in other cells. Again, Claim 18 requires the second master, not the slave, to provide the first master with a hopping sequence. Additionally, the base stations of Trompower et al. only send their hopping sequence to other base stations in new base station registration

packets. Thus, Trompower et al. does not disclose the second master being adapted to provide the first master with a hopping sequence of the slave device as claimed in Claim 18.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 18. The rejection of Claim 18 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 19-21 depend from allowable Claim 18 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CLAIM 23

Regarding amended Claim 23, Trompower et al. at least fails to teach “polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave” as claimed in amended Claim 23.

As illustrated with respect to Claim 14, Trompower et al. does not disclose polling the first master from the second master to determine if the first master is receiving a signal from the slave device.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Trompower et al. fails to teach the limitations of Claim 23. The rejection of Claim 23 is thus unsupported, and must be withdrawn. Claims 24-25 depend from allowable Claim 23 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: Feb. 23, 2004

Rita M. Wisor

Rita M. Wisor
Reg. No. 41,382

Attorney Phone Number:

(512) 314-0340

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

2.23.04

Date of Deposit

Derek S. Watson

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

[Signature]

Signature

2.23.04

Date